EXHIBIT C

PAOLILLO-9/28/05

Page 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

CA NO. 04-12382 (RCL)

DEPOSITION OF ANTHONY P. PAOLILLO, taken pursuant to Rule 30(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, before Susan L. Prokopik, Registered Merit Reporter and Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, at the offices of Nixon Peabody LLP, 100 Summer Street, Boston, Massachusetts, on Wednesday, September 28, 2005, at 9:19 a.m.

KACZYNSKI REPORTING
72 CHANDLER STREET, SUITE 3
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02116
(617) 426-6060

Page 138 1 Upon reviewing our returns, Mr. 2 Martineau came back and said since we had 3 significant net operating losses that we were 4 constantly carrying forward that all we would 5 need to do in that case is to adjust that net 6 operating losses for the years in question, 7 either to adjust it in total or adjust it just a 8 specific period so he left it up to us. As long 9 as we adjusted it and reflected it on our net 10 operating loss schedules. 11 That was the extent of the meeting. 12 The meeting was more a review than a meeting. 13 Q. I see. So his role, Mr. Martineau's role was not 14 with respect to the Competent Authority

- 15 proceeding? 16 A. Not at all.
- 17 Q. But rather with respect to the tax returns of
- 18 Wang --
- 19 A. Exactly.
- 20 Q. -- and the adjustment of those tax returns, if
- 21 necessary, right?
- 22 A. Exactly.

1

- 23 Q. And as far as you knew, Mr. Martineau didn't have
- 24 any responsibility for the Competent Authority

- in Wang's tax returns of the deductions that had 1
 - 2 been made?
 - 3 A. Correct.
 - 4 Q. Okay.
 - 5 A. That's it.
 - Q. So you would agree with me that his own 6
 - 7 statements about what happened in the Competent

Page 140

Page 141

- 8 Authority proceeding are not the -- can't be
- 9 relied upon?
- 10 A. I would say that they do not reflect what went on as part of the Competent Authority. 11
- Q. That's fine. 12
 - (12/16/02 letter marked Exhibit No.
- 35.) 14

13

- 15 (12/16/02 letter marked Exhibit No.
- 16 36.)
- 17 (12/16/02 letter marked Exhibit No.
- 18 37.)
- 19 O. I'm going to show you Exhibits 34 through -- 35
- 20 through 37, each of which is a letter of December
- 21 16, 2002 from you. 35 to Hynix Semiconductor, 36
- 22 to LG Electronics and 37 to Samsung Electronics,
- 23 correct?
- 24 A. Correct.

Page 139

- proceeding?
- 2 A. Not at all. Like I said, his role was just a
- 3 field agent to come out to verify how we handled 4 this on the return.
- 5 Q. Okay. And so you don't rely on anything that Mr.
- 6 Martineau may have said in this letter in support
- 7 of your claim?
- 8 A. I'm not sure I would say that other than -- I'm
- 9 not sure I would not -- I'm not sure I would say 10
 - that I wouldn't rely on anything he said here.
- 11 Q. Well, what would --
- A. I'm not -- to just give a blanket statement, he 12
- 13 is an IRS agent. He is trying to state --
- 14 granted that he is not a Competent Authority
- 15 agent other than he's required just to verify the
- 16 return piece.
- Q. Okay. But you've acknowledged to me that he was 17
- 18 not -- Mr. Martineau was not involved in the
- 19 Competent Authority proceeding, correct?
- 20 A. He was not.
- Q. He didn't have responsibility for the Competent 21
- 22 Authority proceeding?
- 23 A. Correct.
- Q. And his only role was to verify the tax treatment

- Q. And with the exception of some -- of a number in
- each of them, they're the exact same letter, 2
- 3 correct?
- 4 A. Correct.
- 5 Q. Okay. And just so the record is clear, Hynix
- Semiconductor was formerly known as Hyundai 6
- 7 Electronics Industries Company Limited. That's
- 8 your understanding, correct?
- 9 A. Yes, yes.
- 10 Q. And the original license agreement had been
- 11 between Wang and Hyundai, which was now known as
- 12 Hvnix?
- A. (Witness nods.) 13
- 14 Q. Right?
- 15 A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. And this is your letter advising the --16
- 17 each of the companies about the resolution of the
- 18 negotiation between the United States Government
- 19 and Korean National Tax Authority on the
- 20 Competent Authority request, right?
- 21 A. Correct.
- 22 Q. Okay. And you referred to this as a mutual
- 23 agreement, which it is, correct? Which it was?
- A. I took the wording out of the --24